UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,490	01/22/2002	Walter Prikoszovich	100-7664F/C5	6537
1095 NOVARTIS	7590 06/30/200	8	EXAMINER	
CORPORATE	INTELLECTUAL PRO	OPERTY	FISHER, ABIGAIL L	
ONE HEALTH EAST HANOV	ER, NJ 07936-1080		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/054,490	PRIKOSZOVICH, WALTER		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ABIGAIL FISHER	1616		

A	BIGAIL FISHER	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	s on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 28 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following rep application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFF periods:	e same day as filing a Notice of A lies: (1) an amendment, affidavit (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advis no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	than SIX MONTHS from the mailing ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n. .ED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the short set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	sion and the corresponding amount of tened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>May 28 2008</u> . A brief in condate of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	'(e)), to avoid dismissa	al of the appeal.			
	prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	20112			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	e issues for			
(d) ☑ They present additional claims without canceling a cor	responding number of finally reje	cted claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121.		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			(P (b			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).	able if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmen	t canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) A how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>56-58,60,64,66-68 and 74-82</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>83</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and so was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Nentered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary ar	come <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation or	•					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but do	pes NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:			
See Continuation Sheet.	(O/OD/OO) D N ()					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the rejections are maintained for the reasons provided in the Final Office Action mailed on November 28 2007. Bodmer et al. discloses the microparticles comprising a polypeptide in a polymeric matrix, preferably poly(lactide-co-glycolide) glucose. Bodmer et al. indicates that the polymers are known and described in GB 2145422. Brich et al. (GB 2145422) discloses the synthesis of the lactide with tin-octoate. The polyol ester are purified and isolated in a conventional manner. Instant claim 74 claims that the metals have a concentration up to 10 ppm. The instant specification indicates that the polylactides purified by the prior art contain about 2 ppm (page 1, third paragraph). This type of purification would read on instant claim 74 which requires up to 10 ppm. Regarding the ethyl hexanoate impurity, there is nothing in the claims that prevent this impurity from being present as long as it does not affect the claimed color. Regarding the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, it is Mr. Schneider opinion that one of ordinary skill in the art would nto combine the Bodmer, GB '422, and Reiners reference because the chemistry involved is different and that Reiners is directed for components for dental materials. This is not found persuasive. First, Reiners descirbes the synthesis of polymers utilizing tin octonate. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look at Reiners as an alternative to removal of the tin octonate as it is directed to formation of polymers utilizing the same catalyst. The fact that the polymers are different (i.e. polylactide vs. polyacrylates) would not persuade one of ordinary skill in the art against utilizing active charcoal in the purification. Mr. Schneider argues that one polymer (polylactide) can be hydrolyzed while the polymers of Reiners can not. However, hydrolysis does not factor into the synthesis of the polymers. Therefore, the rejection of claims 56-58, 60, 64, 66-68, 74-82 is m